



**The California Watershed Council**  
**Economics and Funding Workgroup**  
Documentation for Meeting  
November 12, 2003



The California Environmental Protection Agency

## **Economics and Funding Workgroup:**

Resources Agency Sponsor:

Mark Cowin, Department of Water Resources

**Phone:** 916-442-8530

**e-mail:** mcowin@water.ca.gov

Cal/EPA Sponsor:

Barbara Evoy, State Water Resources Control Board

**Phone:** 916-341-5632

**e-mail:** evoyb@cwpswrcb.ca.gov

Public Member Co-Lead:

Nettie Drake

e-mail: ndrake@psnw.com

## **Agenda:**

1. The Operational Guidance and the next CWC Meeting – Cal/EPA
2. Workgroup Leadership - All
3. Goals and Objectives of the Workgroup – Resources Agency
4. Workgroup Coordination – Cal/EPA
5. Next Workgroup Meeting - All

## **Operational Guidance for CWC Workgroups**

### **A. General Policies**

1. Workgroups shall be established with broad-based regional or statewide representatives.
2. Workgroup chairs will ensure that adequate (at least one week) notification of an upcoming meeting is given to all members and the public.
3. All meeting notices and minutes will be posted by the Co-Sponsor Agencies after the information is forwarded by the workgroups.
4. Each workgroup will be responsible for drafting their own documentation, such as agendas, minutes, reports, etc.
5. If needed, sub-groups of each workgroup may be established to address specific issues.
6. Workgroup leads will inform the workgroup coordinator of any resources necessary to accomplish the work of the workgroup.
7. Workgroups can meet via telephone, at meetings, or via email. Members are encouraged to communicate with each other via email as much as possible.
8. Recommendations will be developed by the workgroups for submittal for consideration by the CWC. The Co-Leads of the group will identify priority topics for recommendations.
9. Recommendations will be finalized and approved by the workgroup via consensus or another approval process identified by the Co-Leads.

**B. Establishment of Workgroups** - New workgroups may be established in one of two ways:

1. **By Co-Chair Consensus** - The CWC Co-Chairs may establish workgroups and propose leadership to address important short- or long-term watershed related matters that are not already addressed by existing workgroup efforts. The Co-Chairs shall consider the following information:
  - A description of the proposed workgroup mission and leadership,
  - The CWC goals and objectives that will be addressed,
  - Information that ensures that the proposed workgroup scope is not duplicative or not already being addressed by an existing workgroup,
  - Frequency of meetings.
2. **By Petition** - Any stakeholder group may submit a petition to the Cal/EPA or Resources Agency Co-Leads to become a recognized CWC workgroup. This petition shall include the following information, at a minimum:
  - A description of the proposed workgroup mission, problem being addressed and leadership,
  - The CWC goals and objectives that will issues to be addressed,
  - Information that ensures that the proposed workgroup scope is not duplicative or not already being addressed by an existing workgroup,
  - Decision-making model (i.e., consensus, vote, etc.),
  - A description of the proposed workgroup representation (i.e., government, academia, NGOs, private sector, the public, etc.),
  - Frequency of meetings and dates of meetings.

Petitions will be accepted and considered at the meetings of the CWC.

**C. Termination of Workgroups** - A workgroup may be dissolved by the Co-Chairs in one of two ways:

1. A workgroup has accomplished its mission: Once a workgroup has completed the task or objectives that it was established to perform, the Co-Chairs may dissolve the group
2. Poor Workgroup Performance: A workgroup may be dissolved or restructured if it is performing poorly (based on Workgroup Agreement with Co-Leads and stakeholder feedback), has veered from its original mission, does not produce measurable results to help accomplish CWC goals and objectives, or by Co-Chair consensus.

**D. Roles of Workgroup members:**

**CWC Co-chairs:**

- Approve formation of work groups
- Ensure that council and work group meeting schedules, agendas, and minutes are available to public and all CWC participants

- Clarify level of support for other CWC activities on an annual basis
- Provide direction to work groups to assist Agencies in meeting legislative requirements (e.g. timelines and information needs for report to Legislature)

### **Work Groups:**

#### Co-leads:

- Work with group to refine objectives from first meeting into a work plan.
- Workplan should have short and longer term objectives, specific deliverables, and timelines.
- Ensure that work plan elements are feasible given current resources, group participants, and planned levels of participation.
- Ensure that short-term objectives address year one priorities of MOU, including information to be included in report to Legislature. Some of these may be applicable to several groups. For example, several groups may wish to:
  - recommend programs that should be coordinated to improve services (e.g. grant programs by Funding/Econ group; GIS, database and project-tracking programs by Data/Info Exchange; technical assistance by Outreach/Education).
  - "Continue work on watershed strategy".

#### Participants:

- Record and type minutes.
- Fully participate as planned.

#### Workgroup coordinator:

- Develops agenda with input from Co-Leads
- Obtains resources for any meeting or gathering of members
- Posts minutes or other information from the workgroup
- Central point of contact for the drafting, review, and approval of recommendations
- Consolidates recommendations and prepares for presentation before the CWC

### **F. Coordination with the CWC**

1. The workgroups are an advisory body to the CWC. Communication between the chairs of the groups and the CWC can be made between CWC meetings via the Cal/EPA and Resources Agency Co-Leads or the Workgroup Coordinator. On a regular basis, workgroups will report back to ensure that recommendations are being developed according to an agreed upon timeline.
2. At each meeting of the CWC, the workgroups will provide recommendations addressing a topic considered by the workgroup. This recommendation will allow the CWC to adopt a resolution supporting the findings in the recommendation or forward a resolution to an appropriate Board or Commission. The CWC will also have the ability to refer the recommendation to another workgroup or to the originating workgroup for further work.

## Goals and Objectives

<b><u>WORKGROUP MINUTES SUMMARY</u></b>	<b><u>MOU REQUIREMENTS: FY 03/04</u></b>	<b><u>STRATEGIC PLAN : YEAR 1 (FY 2003/04) PRIORITIES</u></b>
<p><u>Issues:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prop 40 and 50, funding criteria, etc.</li> <li>- Equity – geographic, small and large, recipient type, new and old groups, NGOs and agencies</li> <li>- Need access to funds outside CalFed</li> <li>- Need funds for capacity building</li> <li>- Assistance and credibility for small groups</li> <li>- Regional priorities</li> <li>- Funds for monitoring</li> <li>- Criteria for Prop 40 Integrated Water Account</li> <li>• Grant processes: operations, technical assistance, contracts</li> <li>- Program delivery, grant processes, contracting, and compliance/reporting</li> <li>- Reduce time for contracting, payment</li> <li>- Implement best funding practices</li> <li>- Streamline reporting/admin tasks</li> <li>- Funding for multi-year projects</li> <li>- Upfront funding</li> <li>• Sustainable and alternative funding methodologies</li> <li>- Need for predictable funding – public and private</li> <li>- Consider non-competitive funds for capacity building; for public lands</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CWC recommends               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ specific programs and/or issues for coordinated processes.</li> <li>○ strategy for review and modification, if needed, of the draft State Agency Watershed Strategic Plan</li> <li>○ process for implementation of the MOU and development of the California Watershed Strategy.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. CWC identifies priority programs, issues, and processes for meeting multiple program priorities and goals.</li> <li>5. CWC reviews funding opportunities, Agency Program goals, and CWC priorities and issues for applicability, integration, and coordination.</li> <li>6. CWC reviews funding opportunities, Agency goals, and CWC priorities for applicability, integration and coordination (<i>anyone know what this sentence means?</i>)</li> <li>7. CWC develops recommendations for criteria to ensure that the award of watershed project funding meets the goals and priorities of the CWC and this MOU.</li> <li>8. CWC makes recommendations for the development of the IWMP, and processes for the new grant program (Public Resources Code section 30947).</li> <li>11. CWC continues development and updating of the California Watershed Strategy.</li> </ol>	<p><u>Initiative 7 (Funding)</u>  <u>Coordinate funding activities to encourage and fund watershed scale projects</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce confusion, complexity, fragmentation and time delays</li> <li>• Ensure grants support planning, organizational development, tech assistance and monitoring</li> <li>• Emphasize regional prioritization</li> <li>• Incorporate multi-objective criteria</li> <li>• Integrate diverse interests in application process</li> <li>• Ensure long-term funding for local projects</li> <li>• Ensure coordination of grant awards with local watershed plans and priorities</li> <li>• Ensure incentive-based funding for program for developing and sustaining councils</li> <li>• Accountability measures for recipients</li> </ul>

**Notes from August 28, 2003 Meeting:**  
**CWC council**  
**Funding and Economics Work Group**  
**August 28, 2003**

Facilitator: Heather Barnette, Resources Agency

Note Taker: BG Tackett

Agency Subject Specialists: Barbara Evoy (SWRCB), John Lowrie (CalFed)

Reporter: Nettie Drake, MFG, Inc.

1. What work groups are needed?
  - a. One work group is to be formed, versus many sub-groups.
  - b. Sub groups can be identified as needed.
  - c. Initial topics to be considered by the work group are:
    - i. Prop 40 and 50, funding criteria, etc.
    - ii. Sustainable and alternative funding sources and methodologies
    - iii. Grant processes (potential sub-group)
      1. Operations- use of state organization vs. private foundations
      2. Technical assistance- planning, development and implementation
      3. Contracts- process and execution
    - iv. Executive contacts are:  
Barbara Evoy - SWRCB  
John Lowrie - Calfed  
Neil Fishman –Coastal Conservancy
2. What are key deliverables and goals of the work groups?
  - a. These are to be defined at future meetings. The current group did not want to have special meetings of just this committee, they were more interested and willing to meet during other watershed based meetings or conferences.
3. Who will participate?
  - a. Anyone that wants to or has the time.
  - b. Methods of communication will be delineated in the future. It was determined that email would most likely be the primary method of communication, however the comment that not everyone has email but would still like to participate was clear. Once the contact list is generated, it would be easier to identify who did not have email and they would receive a mailed envelope of information. There was a question about who would do the mailing and who was going to pay for it.
  - c. Initially, notes etc. will be emailed per the contact list generated at the inaugural meeting. Denise Sagara, Executive Director of the Yolo County Farm Bureau, was willing to put the initial mailing/email list together. Here contact email is [denise@yolofarmbureau.org](mailto:denise@yolofarmbureau.org)
4. What are the next steps?
  - a. Set priorities
  - b. Set Schedule
  - c. Operations

1. The State should consult with this group on day briefing forum/
2. Attend California Watershed forum
3. CWC piggy back on other meetings
- d. The “Next Steps” committee consist of Denise Sagara, BG Tackett, Tonya Redfield, Cheri Jagers, and Nettie Drake. A phone conference call should be arranged after the Watershed Forum to discuss how and what this committee is going to do.

#### Issues and concerns

1. Lack of predictable funding.
2. Equity
  - a. Geographic
  - b. Small vs. large
  - c. Recipient type
  - d. New vs. old program
3. No explanation of rejection when applying for grants
4. Small groups credibility issue to being able to handle/manage grant funds
5. Regional priorities used to set financial allocation both implied and perceived
6. Reducing payment time for paying approved, submitted invoices
7. Time table from the proposal to executed contract is to long, process needs to be refined.
8. Agencies rarely respond to needs or information presented by grantee.
9. Alternative sources of funding- private, public, combination of both
10. Cost of reporting and other administrative efforts – stream line the process for both the grantee and the granting agency.
11. Non Calfed areas need greater access to funds- Need to focus on legislative language.
12. Up-front funds after projects are approved- Need to develop an easy to operate and manage process.
13. Multi year projects are being encouraged, but the funding is not there to back them up.
14. Use of a non-public agencies to outsource admin of contracts and reporting (ie. NFWF, ABAG, etc.)
15. Funding for monitoring and maintenance needs to be increased and standardize and approved guidelines need to be approved by all interested agencies.
16. Uniform or consistent reporting standards of grant funds established for the public entity and grantee can understand and follow.
17. Non-competitive funding for capacity building needs to be investigated.
18. CWC should be encouraging sustainable sources of funding for projects
19. Prop 40 integrated water account needs grant criteria set. \*\*\*
20. Assistance program to smaller entities to give agencies a level of comfort in dealing with those entities
21. Funding for NGO vs. public agencies should be equalized
22. Best funding practices from Bio diversity council needs to be implemented
23. Non-competitive set aside funds for public lands needs to be investigated.
24. Match requirement is limiting to small groups, either alternative needs to be developed with criteria or match ideas and options need to be identified.
25. Two tiered funding program, small vs. large groups, etc.